



61

2874

RECEIVED

SEP 10 2003

PTO/SB92 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2003

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop: Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

August 29, 2003

on _____

Date

William H. Dippert
Registration No. 26,723

Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, New York 10022-7650
Tel: 212-521-5400; Fax: 212-521-5450

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Applicant: Zev ZALEVSKY, et al.
Serial No: 09/907,252
Filing Date: July 17, 2001
For: A METHOD AND DEVICE FOR POLARIZATION-BASED ALL-OPTICAL SWITCHING
Enclosures: (1) Transmittal Letter (in duplicate); (2) Amendment (8 pages); (3) Acknowledgement Postcard.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



TRANSMITTAL LETTER
(General - Patent Pending)

Docket No.
298/02511

In Re Application Of: Zeev Zalevsky, et al.

Serial No.
09/907,252

Filing Date
July 17, 2001

Examiner
WOOD, Kevin S.

Group Art Unit
2874

Title: A METHOD AND DEVICE FOR POLARIZATION-BASED ALL-OPTICAL SWITCHING

ATTENTION: PRIMARY EXAMINER BRIAN HEALY

TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE:

Transmitted herewith is:

Response to Office Action dated June 9, 2003

in the above identified application.

- ☒ No additional fee is required.
- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is attached.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 03-3419 as described below.
- ☐ Charge the amount of _____
- ☒ Credit any overpayment.
- ☒ Charge any additional fee required.

Signature

Dated: August 28, 2003

Maier FENSTER, Reg. No. 41,016

William H. Dippert, Esq.
c/o Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: (212) 521-5400

cc:

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited on _____ with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

RECEIVED
SEP 10 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



298/02511 A03

RECEIVED

SEP 10 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Applicant: Zeev Zalevsky et al.

Serial Number: 09/907,252

Filed: July 17, 2001

For: A METHOD AND DEVICE FOR POLARIZATION-BASED ~~ALL~~-OPTICAL

5 SWITCHING

Art Unit: 2874

Examiner: WOOD, Kevin S.

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P. O. Box 1450

10 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

Further to an office action dated June 9, 2003, kindly amend the application as
15 follows:

IN THE ABSTRACT

Kindly replace the abstract with the new abstract enclosed on a separate page.

REMARKS

20 The present amendment is in response to a final office action dated June 9, 2003.
No changes have been made in the claims.

The Examiner objects to the abstract because it is in the form of a claim. The amended abstract is in narrative form, and less than 150 words long.

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.
25 Patent 6,360,037 to Riza. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the second paragraph of the "Response to Arguments" on page 2 of the final office action, the Examiner states that "within the reference [Riza] the two beam components of different polarizations are propagating along the same optical path and are not split into components propagating along different optical paths until they are incident
30 upon the polarizing beam splitting apparatus."

The applicant does not understand how the Examiner can say this, since it is very clear in Riza, in Figs. 3a and 3b (pertinent to our claim 6) and in Figs. 4a and 4b (pertinent to our claim 2), that the two beam components of different polarizations are propagating